Case 2.00-cv-01/11-NSE Document /	73 Tiled 03/00/12 Fage 1 0/3
UNITED STATES I WESTERN DISTRICT	
AT SEA	
)
AVOCENT REDMOND CORP.,) Case No. C06-1711RSL
Plaintiff, v.	
ROSE ELECTRONICS, et al.,	ORDER REGARDING AVOCENT'S MOTION TO SEAL (Dkt. # 637)
Defendants.))
/)
This matter comes before the Court	t on "Avocent's Motion to Seal Documents in
Connection with Avocent's Opposition to Belkin	's Motion for Partial Summary Judgment."
Dkt. # 637. Avocent seeks permission to redact a	and/or file certain documents under seal because
various parties and third-party vendors designated	d the documents or certain topics as confidential
during discovery.	
Avocent filed a publicly-accessible	version of its opposition memorandum and two
of the contested exhibits with redactions. Dkt. #	650, # 651, and # 659. Having reviewed
Avocent's motion to seal and the underlying docu	uments, the Court finds as follows:
(1) The version of Avocent's opposition t	to Belkin's motion for partial summary
judgment filed at Dkt. # 659 is and shall remain p	publicly accessible. The redactions contained
therein are modest and relate to confidential busin	ness information. The redactions do not
unnecessarily impede the public's understanding	of the issues presented in this case or the
Court's rulings. No further disclosures are neces	sary.
(2) "There is a strong presumption of pub	lic access to the court's files," and, absent a
ORDER REGARDING AVOCENT'S	

MOTION TO SEAL (Dkt. # 637)

"compelling showing that the public's right of access is outweighed by the interests of the public and the parties," a seal is not appropriate. Local Civil Rule 5(g)(2). In support of the request for permission to seal documents produced by Belkin, Avocent simply notes that the documents were designated as confidential during discovery. Neither plaintiff nor Belkin has attempted to justify the designation or the proposed seal. As the Court has previously noted, a party's unilateral designation of a document as "confidential" does not, in and of itself, establish the necessary "compelling showing" under Local Civil Rule 5(g)(2). In the absence of any discussion regarding the actual confidentiality of the information, the possible implications of public disclosure, and the public's interest in access to these records, the Court will not assume that a seal is justified.¹

- (3) Exhibit 2 to the Declaration of David J. Shaw (Dkt. # 640) clearly falls within the scope of confidential information as defined in the Protective Order entered in this litigation (Dkt. # 116).
- (4) The redacted version of Exhibit 16 to the Declaration of David J. Shaw (Dkt. # 651) is and shall remain publicly accessible. The redactions contained therein are modest and relate to confidential business information. The redactions do not unnecessarily impede the public's understanding of the issues presented in this case or the Court's rulings. No further disclosures are necessary.
- (4) Exhibit 24 (the expert report of William O. Kerr) and Exhibit 29 (quarterly financial data) to the Declaration of David J. Shaw (part of Dkt. # 644 and Dkt. # 648, respectively) shall remain under seal for purposes of Belkin's motion for partial summary judgment.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Avocent's motion to seal (Dkt. # 637) is

¹ The Court notes that Avocent took it upon itself to provide a redacted version of Exhibit 1 to the Declaration of David J. Shaw. Dkt. # 650. Absent some showing that Belkin's interests in confidentiality exceed the public's interest in full access, the Court finds that even these limited redactions are not justified.

Case 2:06-cv-01711-RSL Document 775 Filed 09/06/12 Page 3 of 3

GRANTED in part. Because Docket # 640 and # 646 were filed in such a way that confidential information cannot be electronically separated from the materials that will be disclosed to the public, those docket entries will remain sealed, in their entirety. Avocent is hereby directed to file unsealed versions of Exhibits 1, 3, 25, 26, and 27 within three days of the date of this Order. DATED this 6th day of September, 2012. MMS (asuk)
Robert S. Lasnik United States District Judge